

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/070,697	04/04/2002	Takashi Mimura	1061-02	9428	
35811	7590 01/30/2006		EXAM	INER	
IP GROUP OF DLA PIPER RUDNICK GRAY CARY US LLP			VO, HAI		
SUITE 4900			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103			1771		

DATE MAILED: 01/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

~/
ж.
"

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/070,697	MIMURA ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Hai Vo	1771			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
WHIC - External after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.15 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period ver to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	I. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status		•				
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 N	ovember 2005				
•=	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.					
/	Since this application is in condition for allowar		secution as to the merits is			
,	closed in accordance with the practice under E	•				
Dispositi	on of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 13-24 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 13-24 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	vn from consideration.				
Applicati	on Papers					
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	epted or b) objected to by the Eddrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority ι	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) <u>□</u> a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Application in the contraction is a second in the contraction	on No ed in this National Stage			
Attachmen						
2)	e of References Cited (PTO-892) se of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:				

Application/Control Number: 10/070,697 Page 2

Art Unit: 1771

1. All of the art rejections have been withdrawn in view of the present amendment. The combined teachings of the cited references does not teach a reflector wherein the coating layer comprises mainly a copolymer of a resin with a light stabilizer component. However, upon further consideration, new grounds of rejections are made in view of WO 00/02964, which is an equivalent form of Ogawa et al (US 6,703,139).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 13-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyakawa et al (US 5,672,409) in view of WO 00/02964. US 6,703,139 to Ogawa et al is relied on as an equivalent form of WO 00/02964. Miyakawa teaches a reflector for surface light sources comprising a white film having a three-layer structure A/B/A wherein the B-layer is made of a polyester resin and contains fine voids (column 6, lines 35-40, example 2). Miyakawa teaches a coating layer on the white film comprising a mixture of acrylic resin, silica particles, and fluorescent whitening agent (example 5). Miyakawa discloses the white film having the degree of glossiness within the claimed range (table 1). Miyakawa teaches the white film is formed from a resin composition consisting essentially of polyester (column 3, lines 25-45). Miyakawa teaches that the voids

Art Unit: 1771

are formed through melt extrusion of a mixture of a polyester resin, a polyolefin resin, and inorganic particles, followed by stretching the film in at least one direction (column 3, line 59 et seq.). Miyakawa is silent as to the coating layer comprising a copolymer of an acrylic resin with a light stabilizer component. Ogawa, however, discloses the use of a weather resistant composition coating on the optical instruments comprising an ultraviolet absorber, a methacrylic monomer and a curing agent (column 4, lines 20-65, column 16, lines 65-67, table 8). Likewise, Ogawa discloses the weather resistant composition coating comprising a copolymer of a methacrylic resin and an ultraviolet absorber. Ogawa teaches the ultraviolet absorber can be RUVA-1 or UVA-1 (column 18, lines 35-65). Ogawa discloses bisbenzotriazolylphenol renders the coating material superior in weather resistance over conventional UV absorber benzophenone. Ogawa has recognized the draw back associated with the use of conventional UV absorber and is the first who has invented the use of the coating layer comprising a copolymer of a methacrylic resin with a benzophenone before Applicants (see tables 1, 5, 6 and 7). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the combination of an acrylic acid resin with an UV absorber in the presence of a curing agent as a coating layer of Miyawa motivated by the desire to provide the coating layer exhibiting excellent weather resistance and transparency for a prolonged period and less likely to cause surface cracks.

Miyakawa does not specifically disclose that the voids in the surface layer are smaller than the voids in the inner layer. However, Miyakawa teaches that the A-layer contains inorganic fine particles and the sheet of the laminated polymers A/B/A is stretched in at least one direction (example 3). It appears that Miyakawa and Applicants are using inorganic particles having similar particle size and present in the same amounts in the A- and B-layers (Miyakawa, column 6, lines 40-42, 60-65 vs. Applicants' specification, pages 10 and 22). Further, Miyakawa is using the same approach to form the voids in the white film. The voids are created around the inorganic particles through stretching. Therefore, it is the examiner's position that the relative void diameter in the A-layer and Blayer would be inherently present because it seems from the claim, if one meets the structure recited, the properties must be met or Applicant's claim is incomplete. This is in line with *In re Spada*, 15 USPQ 2d 1655 (1990) which holds that products of identical chemical composition can not have mutually exclusive properties.

4. Claims 13-17, 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishii et al (US 5,710,856) in view of WO 00/02964. US 6,703,139 to Ogawa et al is relied on as an equivalent form of WO 00/02964. Ishii discloses a light reflective sheet comprising a porous resin sheet and a protective layer laminated on at least one surface of the porous resin sheet (abstract). Ishii discloses that the protective layer contains a light stabilizer component (column 14, lines 45-48, column 8, line 61). Ishii teaches the coating

Art Unit: 1771

layer further comprising inorganic fine particles (column 13, lines 60-62). Ishii teaches a light reflective sheet having a light reflectance greater than 85% (table 1). Ishii teaches a porous resin layer comprising a fluorescent brightener (column 8, lines 50-57). Ishii does not specifically disclose the protective layer containing a copolymer of an acrylic resin and an UV absorber. Ogawa, however, discloses the use of a weather resistant composition coating on the optical instruments comprising an ultraviolet absorber, a methacrylic monomer and a curing agent (column 4, lines 20-65, column 16, lines 65-67, table 8). Likewise, Ogawa discloses the weather resistant composition coating comprising a copolymer of a methacrylic resin and an ultraviolet absorber. Ogawa teaches the ultraviolet absorber can be RUVA-1 or UVA-1 (column 18, lines 35-65). Ogawa discloses that bisbenzotriazolylphenol renders the coating material superior in weather resistance over conventional UV absorber benzophenone. Ogawa has recognized the draw back associated with the use of conventional UV absorber and is the first who has invented the use of the coating layer comprising a copolymer of a methacrylic resin with a benzophenone before Applicants (see tables 1, 5, 6 and 7). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the combination of an acrylic acid resin with an UV absorber in the presence of a curing agent as a coating layer of Ishii motivated by the desire to provide the coating layer exhibiting excellent weather resistance and transparency for a prolonged period and less likely to cause surface cracks.

Application/Control Number: 10/070,697 Page 6

Art Unit: 1771

Ishii does not specifically disclose the degree of glossiness of the light reflective sheet. However, the light reflective sheet of Ishii as modified Ogawa is structurally the same and made of the same materials as Applicants' article. It appears that the light reflective sheet of Ishii as modified by Ogawa has a light reflectance within the claimed range. Therefore, it is not seen that the modified light reflective sheet would have possessed the degree of glossiness outside the range as claimed by the present invention. This is in line with *Ex part slob*, 157 USPQ 172. It seems from the claim, if one meets the structure recited, the properties must be met or Applicant's claim is incomplete.

5. Claims 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishii et al (US 5,710,856) in view of WO 00/02964 as applied to claim 13 above, further in view of Miyakawa et al (US 5,672,409). Ishii does not disclose the porous resin layer being a composite film. Miyakawa, however, teaches a reflector for surface light sources comprising a white film having a three-layer structure A/B/A wherein the B-layer contains fine voids (column 6, lines 35-40, example 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the porous resin layer in the form of a composite film having a layer construction as taught by Miyakawa motivated by the desire to provide to enhance structural stability of the white film.

Conclusion

 Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hai Vo whose telephone number is (571) 272-1485. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, from 6:00 to 2:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel Morris can be reached on (571) 272-1478. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/070,697 Page 8

Art Unit: 1771

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

HV

1100 00

HAIVO PRIMARY EXAMINER